

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/628,830 | DUNDAS ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Robert B. Davis | 1722 |

All Participants:

(1) Robert B. Davis.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Thomas Hooker, Esq.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 September 2005

Time: 11:54

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Proposed rejection of claims 1 and 22 over Bailey et al (2,674,006: figure 4).

Claims discussed:

1 and 22

Prior art documents discussed:

Bailey et al (2,674,006).


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Mr. Hooker to discuss issues regarding claims 1 and 22 in regards to Bailey et al (specifically figure 4) as the reference shows an extrusion head having two outlet ports wherein port 39 extends partly beyond port 39a. The examiner gave Mr. Hooker the patent number and specifically referenced figure 4. Mr. Hooker called the examiner back and suggested amendments to claims 1 and 22. The changes are shown in the attached examiner's amendment. The examiner agreed that the proposed amendments would overcome the reference. Mr. Hooker also proposed voluntarily amendments to correct claim informalities in claims 27, 28, 32 and 33. It was agreed that the proposed changes would be made by examiner's amendment..